

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Reply is in response to the Advisory Action mailed June 1, 2010 (and Office Action mailed March 23, 2010). Applicants' previous amendment of May 24, 2010 was entered by the Examiner. Before this Reply, claims 32-42, 44-48, and 50-52, 55-56, 59-60, and 65-68 were pending. In this Reply, no claims have been amended, no claims are canceled, and no new claims are presented for consideration. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

The Advisory Action points out that the Specification of the Application says, "Dynamic functions are **optionally** configured to perform logic operations, external process calls, or other operations associated with a computer function and to transform payload Data 230 in response" (emphasis added). **Optional** language in the specification should not be read as limitations of the claims or as definitions of terms to which the optional language refers. Furthermore, "a specification of [a] function," to which the Advisory action refers, is not in the Specification.

The Advisory Action avers that Lee paragraphs [0303], [0311], and [0318] describe calling functions from "peripheral programs." The "peripheral programs" to which Lee paragraph [0303] refers include those for "providing a workflow function navigation bar, a search bar/window, and a standard navigation bar" (Lee paragraph [0303]). These navigation bar/search window programs are not functions "defined **in** the first compound transform definition [within a transform process definition]" (emphasis added) as currently recited in independent claim 32. There is no navigation bar or search window program defined in Lee's XML files of paragraph [0305], [0309], [0312], or [0318]. Instead, the navigation bar/search window peripheral programs to which Lee refers appear to be user interfaces for maintaining identities in its Identity System. Lee paragraph [0311] discloses a directive call for a program to select an entry *from the directory server*. Calling a directory server is not calling a function "defined **in** the first compound transform definition" as claimed. Lee paragraph [0318] discloses an XML template calling for data from an attribute based on the status of another attribute, such as the name and e-mail address of a person. The XML's calling is through *a search program*

(Lee paragraph [0318]) and not “a dynamic function defined **in** the first compound transform definition” as claimed. None of the cited paragraphs of Lee disclose, teach, or suggest the limitations as recited.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of the claims and all claims depending therefrom.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark Mathison', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Mark Mathison
Reg. No. 57,556

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 925-472-5000
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachments
MPM:cta
62729496 v1